Even Aviation Week Admits The ABM Futile, P. 2

Like Waiting For The Second Coming

"I don't know just what connection there is between the difficulties in the Middle East and the mutual interest of the U.S. and the Soviet Union to avoid an escalation of the arms race, and if you are going to wait to enter the conference [on nuclear missiles] until peace and love prevail in the Middle East, or until there is no longer trouble in Southeast Asia, then ABMs [anti-ballistic missiles] will be all over the place in both countries."

—Senator Gore (D.Tenn) to Secretary of Defense Laird at the Senate Foreign Relations hearing February 20

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVII, NO. 5 MARCH 10, 1969 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20 CENTS

Can Nixon Make The Hard Choices?

President Nixon has given three signals which provide some gleam of hope. One was the substitution at his first press conference of "sufficiency" for "superiority" as the standard for judging America's armed forces; coupled with this was his explanation that the less abrasive term would make arms negotiation easier. The second signal was the sending of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Pact to the Senate *before* his trip to Europe. This placed priority on arms talks with the Russians. Had he gone to Europe first, this would have meant giving the wishes of the NATO powers—in particular West Germany—priority, consulting them in advance, allowing the West Germans, who dislike the treaty, a kind of veto. By sending the treaty to the Senate first, Nixon was going abroad not so much to "consult", as to allay misgivings, a very different sort of operation. The meaning of the trip was made plainer when the new President told a private meeting with French leaders* that limiting the arms race was of "enormous importance" but had to be negotiated by the two superpowers alone. The third signal is the extraordinarily restrained way that the Nixon Administration is taking the new enemy offensive in Vietnam; normally hawkish U.S. civilian and military spokesmen in Saigon seem, from a close reading of the dispatches, to be under wraps imposed by Washington.

Nixon A Leftist Tool?

While the President was abroad, ADA's vice-chairman, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., held a press conference here to outline its program. With its strong emphasis on blocking the ABM and fighting the influence of the military-industrial complex we are in complete agreement. But when Schlesinger said "No new President in memory has made so little effort in his first weeks in office to define his purposes" we wonder whether he did not speak too soon. A better index of what is happening may be furnished by the speeches Barry Goldwater has begun to make against the Non-Proliferation Pact, opening a rift between him and the new Republican Administration. From a speech to the University Club in New York Feb. 22 by Goldwater I lift a delicious sentence for the future historian. "The push for ratification," Goldwater said, "is part of the emotionalism with which the Radical Left would like to conduct all of our foreign affairs in today's world." Barely a month after the Inaugural Goldwater seemed to be implying that Nixon is a Leftist tool. Is Helen Gahagan Douglas in the house?

Goldwater said the treaty "would have a highly deleterious effect on the Atlantic Alliance." The same charge has been made by two others who helped elect Nixon and now oppose the treaty, Senators Tower of Texas and Thurmond of South Carolina. The trip to NATO Europe may have been designed also to protect Nixon's flank at home. For some Republicans there must seem to be a Nixon Gap—between the man Before and After his election.* The move toward detente which antagonizes them and encourages us may prove of short duration. A prime danger is a new Berlin crisis; if the precarious applecart isn't upset by "our" Germans it may be upset by "theirs." Whatever happens Nixon has already put the prestige of his Administration and the unity of his party on the line by sending the Non-Proliferation Treaty to the Senate. To win its ratification, he must look for support to those who opposed him in the past. The most dramatic evidence of this reversal is furnished by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under Fulbright, which is favorably reporting the treaty to the Senate while the Armed Services Committee under Stennis

(Continued on Page Two)

Laird's Latest Whopper

"They [the Russians] are the only country in the world that has actually fired an ABM at a missile and have conducted tests in the atmosphere with missiles."

—Laird before Senate Foreign Relations Feb. 20

"As long as seven years ago we demonstrated we could with confidence destroy single incoming missiles."

—Secretary Clifford to Senator Russell June 18, 1968, at p. 59, Senate Foreign Relations hearings last July on the Nonproliferation Treaty.

"The Army announced Dec. 21 that a Nike-Zeus anti-missile missile test-fired at the White Sands (New Mexico) missile range had successfully intercepted a missile flight for the first time."

—p. 478A1, Facts on File *for the Year 1961*

***Henry Tanner from Paris, New York Times March 2.**

***And not in foreign policy alone. The Baltimore Sun Feb. 21 said Southern Republicans had been so alienated by Nixon's action during his first month that some questioned whether he could carry any of the 11 Southern States today. "Probably no Southern Republican is more embarrassed and jeopardized," the Sun reported, "than Senator Thurmond who risked his political standing by working hard for Mr. Nixon throughout the South." A bitter pill was James Farmer's appointment as an Assistant Secretary of HEW the same day that school aid was shut off to Greenwood, S.C. with no provision for a grace period.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from Page One)

has scheduled hearings designed to put stumbling blocks in the way of ratification.

Symington Shifts Sides

The liberal committee is on Nixon's side while the right-wing one is swinging against him. Each is invading the jurisdiction of the other. Armed Services muscled in on the treaty on the excuse that it wanted to examine the "military implications" while one Foreign Relations subcommittee under Gore has launched hearings into the ABM and another under Symington into our commitments and bases abroad on the ground that they wish to examine the foreign policy implications of matters which normally are the concern of Armed Services. The latter's chairman, Stennis, is the Pentagon's No. 1 ally in Congress while Fulbright is militarism's foremost critic. The most significant by-play in this struggle is that Symington, the only Senator on both committees, a former Air Force Secretary, has shifted from a champion of the military to a disillusioned opponent. Normally, by seniority, Symington would have become chairman of the powerful Preparedness subcommittee when Stennis succeeded Russell as chairman of the full Armed Services committee. But rather than allow a critic of the military so vital a post, Stennis is holding onto both chairmanships. Symington knows where the bodies are buried because he helped in the past to bury them.

Nixon is going to find it much harder to change his course at home than he has his "image" abroad. Some hard choices lie ahead. The first decision is the ABM, and a related question is what to do about the Goldwaterite he chose as Secretary of Defense.* Laird is campaigning for a build-up not only of an ABM but of strategic offensive missiles. "We are now second to the Soviet Union" in nuclear strength, Goldwater said in the speech from which we have already quoted, and Laird is doing his best to create the same impression. Nixon can hardly expect the Russians to take missile talks seriously if Nixon allows Laird to go on propagating such dangerous nonsense. Indeed it is difficult to understand why Nixon wanted Senator Jackson as

Wanna Bet Dept.

Sen. JAVITS (R.N.Y.)—Do you see the world lining up into the power blocs with the Soviet Union serving Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and so forth and the U.S. serving its friends in the world with peaceful uses of atomic energy [under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty] and a nation like Czechoslovakia being up for grabs or how do you see this thing working?

Dr. SEABORG (Chmn. Atomic Energy Commission): As a practical matter it would in large part, at least, start that way. I could picture, however, particularly if this treaty is as successful as we hope it will be, that these lines won't be drawn. I could picture situations under which it would be to our advantage, for example, to go into Czechoslovakia and furnish this service for them.

Sen. JAVITS: And we couldn't scream very loudly if the Russians went into Latin America, into Peru.

Dr. SEABORG: I would say as the treaty developed and if it served the purpose that we hoped it would, we could look forward to such action with equanimity.

Sen. Foreign Relations treaty hearing Feb. 18.

***Laird in turn has picked one of Goldwater's brain-trusters in the 1964 campaign, G. Warren Nutter, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. This division is the Pentagon's own "State Department" and has considerable influence on foreign policy and arms negotiations. The Washington Post, which swallowed Laird's Goldwaterite record with no more than a slight gulp, balked editorially at Nutter and particularly his "harsh and somewhat simplistic views" on U.S. Soviet relations. (See its editorial "A Strange Appointment at the Pentagon" Feb. 23 and its staff man, Don Oberdorfer's exclusive on Nutter, Feb. 18.) Nutter's nomination has since been approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee. Laird has also named Grant L. Hansen, a vice-president of General Dynamics' least successful division, Convair, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development. Convair is the main contractor for the notorious F-111.**

Some Extraordinary Admissions on Arms Race and ABM In An Aerospace Organ

"The U.S. and the USSR are facing a dilemma in defense expenditures. Both are spending more and getting less in the way of protection and relative stability of position in relation to each other. In both countries, the defense dilemma has reached such proportions that it is forcing major policy changes on the two governments.

"The U.S. appears to be heading for a point of diminishing return in the amount of money it can prudently pour into its defense establishment and toward a dead end in the mainstream of technological development that once gave it a significant superiority over the Soviet Union.

"A decade of furious technical development has given the Soviet Union the opportunity to draw close enough to the U.S. in land- and sea-based nuclear missile power to erode the margin of measurable military significance. The same decade of inflationary spiral has also drastically reduced the genuine military value bought by the U.S. defense budgets that have risen about $40 billion in that interval. During the last half of this decade, the U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia has drained nearly half of the defense budget into the rat hole of Asian combat . . .

"The Pentagon is from $20 to $80 billion short in financing its current requirements. This is a pretty sizable deficit even for the biggest business in the world. It is pretty grim news for the taxpayers whose tattered shirts must be wrung further to plug the gap. This is one of the reasons so many misgivings are now crystallizing around the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile system. It is becoming apparent that deployment of this system will add an enormous new increment—from $15 to $20 billion—to the defense budget *without offering any real possibility of making the nation more secure* . . . [Italics added]

"The tremendous progress of the Soviet Union in modern military technologies has been achieved at an even higher relative cost than that in the U.S. And, like the U.S., the Soviets have found no real military security in the mighty array of supersonic aircraft, nuclear missiles and submarine fleets. They have been hard-pressed to keep within hailing distance of U.S. military technology. They have been unable to exert any real leverage with their military power except along the geographic borders of the Soviet Union.

"These then are the internal pressures that are driving the leaders of both countries to seek some sort of accommodation to level off or limit the portions of their national budgets they must devote to military forces. For with both countries already operating at an oppressively high level of defense expenditures, any new technological race or even a drastic expansion of present force levels could ignite economic and political explosions . . ."

Editorial "The Defense Dilemma" in Aviation Week & Space Technology, *Feb. 24, by its editor, Robert Hotz.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secretary of Defense and took Laird as second choice if he planned seriously to negotiate some brakes on the missile race.

Jackson on *Meet the Press* March 2 produced a new series of nightmares to support the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile system. Since the Chinese menace is wearing thin, Jackson substituted some new fantasies about an FOBS system he said the Russians had as a "first strike" weapon against our bombers! A first strike which started with our bombers would be the surest way for the Russians to unleash our missiles and commit suicide. He also pictured Russian Polaris submarines rolling off the assembly lines, as bombers once were pictured in the days of the bomber gap. So now the Sentinel is to be aimed at the Russians, and if that won't work, perhaps it might be drummed up as extra protection in the event of an invasion from Mars.

40 Congressmen Speak Out

There has never been as much antagonism in Congress as now to the ABM and to the military in general. In the Senate the anti-ABM forces under John Sherman Cooper, Kentucky's Republican elder statesman, may be able with a little extra push from the country to marshal a majority and block the ABM. In the House, three Democrats, Cohelan (*Cal*), Giaimo (*Conn*) and Yates (*Ill*) filed a minority report on the 1969 construction bill Feb. 24 and obtained a special order for a debate on the floor two days later. More than 40 members spoke that day against the ABM; their speeches and inserts, covering 72 pages of that day's Congressional Record are a mine of ammunition against this expensive folly. Unfortunately the American public has a tendency to think problems are solved when moved away. If the Pentagon now moves the missiles and radars away from the big cities, much of the public's concern may evaporate. This would be the nuclear equivalent of the white flight to the suburbs.

Anyone foolish enough to be taken in by commentators who scoff at the idea of a military-industrial complex should read the 16-page "Public Affairs Plan For The Sentinel System." A leak to the *Washington Post* Feb. 16 forced the Pentagon to release it. Its provisions for a coordinated campaign of press, magazine, TV and radio publicity "apply" it says "to all U.S. Army elements *and to all individual industrial firms and civilian contractors* (our italics) participating in the production and deployment of the SENTINEL System." The memorandum outlining this propaganda campaign was addressed by Stanley R. Resor, the present Secretary of the Army, last year to then Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford. The leak, as the *Washington Post* said in an editorial, "The Big ABM Brainwash" (Feb 17), laid bare the "clandestine complicity with the contractors . . . to

(Continued on Page Four)

Alsop's Occult Annals

Unseen, Unpredictable, Unknowable . . .*

"Unseen, indeed invisible, quite unreported in the world press, with results as yet unknowable, a major battle is now in progress in Vietnam. This may seem very eery. . . . It says much about the universal misunderstanding of the pattern of the war, that almost no notice has been taken of a phenomenon so novel, so strange and so remarkable as this battle that is now going on. Yet twice before, as was also pointed out in this space, the B-52s have defeated enemy divisions, almost unaided by our ground troops . . . There is nothing shadowy, please remember, about these earlier episodes. After the enemy divisions have retreated, enough evidence is always collected in the end so that what has happened is known with real certainty. . . . Yet the present shadowy battle is much more important than its predecessors . . . If (and one must triply underline this 'if") this new offensive can also be repelled by almost unaided B-52s, then the Hanoi Politbureau will have to draw some honestly dark conclusions . . . But for the present the outcome is unpredictable, as well as unknowable."

—Joseph Alsop's column of February 19

* Except, of course, to one modest correspondent.

Portrait Of An Admiral Caught In The Umteenth Pratt-Fall Of Its Kind In The Viet War

Q. Admiral McCain, what is the military situation in Vietnam? A. We have the enemy licked now . . . he cannot even mount another major offensive.

—"The Enemy Is Beaten" Interview with the Commander-Chief, Pacific, in Reader's Digest *for February. Fulbright protested its publication to Secretary Laird at a Foreign Relations Commitee hearing Feb. 20 as "very provocative" and damaging to the peace talks in Paris. Fulbright said we had heard this optimism before "and it didn't turn out quite that way." The enemy offensive three days later and the following dispatch shows how right he was:*

"The Americans in Vietnam today officially declared that the fighting over the past four days, which has cost 200 American lives, and more than 2,000 Vietcong lives, could now be called 'the communist offensive.' They also released a short statement on a Wednesday morning attack on Cu Chi base, headquarters of the American 25th Infantry Division and one of the largest and best-defended camps in Vietnam. The base, the official report laconically said, received 10 enemy rockets, and some mortar shells. The statement went on: 'Simultaneously, an unknown size enemy force probed three locations of the perimeter, employing small arms and rocket-grenade fire. During the action, an unknown number of enemy sappers carrying satchel charges infiltrated a portion of the perimeter and caused light material damage before being killed or repelled.'

"As it happened, some newspaper reporters visited Cu Chi base this morning. This is what we saw had actually occurred. Twelve large double rotored Chinook helicopters were put out of action by Vietcong saboteurs. Nine of these were destroyed. They lay, charred wrecks, in their protective bunkers. An ammunition dump was blown up. The total cost of the helicopters and ammunition, bearing in mind that each Chinook costs £700,000 [$1.68m.] was more than £7m [$16.8m.]. The destruction took only five minutes.

"The Cu Chi base is one of the six most important American military establishments in Vietnam. It is the headquarters for the whole area to the north-west of Saigon towards Cambodia, through which North Vietnamese forces are advancing towards the capital. The base had received clear intelligence that it was to be attacked. Yet 80 Vietcong sappers managed to spend three and a half hours cutting through the 10 barbed wire fences that protect Cu Chi perimeter, without any of the American ambush patrols, sentries, and bunker defence units detecting them . . .

"For half an hour the gathered reporters appeal to the information men to allow them to write the truth. 'Light damage,' we argue, just seems ridiculous. The audience of journalists, uncomfortably aware of the reassuring copy many of them had been sending home, hope that the entire military situation in Vietnam has not been distorted as has that at Cu Chi."

—Nicholas Tomalin, London Times *Feb. 27.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The U.S. Has Spent A Trillion Dollars On Weaponry In 20 Years

(Continued from Page Three)

tout the virtues of this weapons system; the unabashed intention to plant or inspire favorable magazine articles by scientists" friendly to the military or under obligation to the Pentagon. We hope the Gore subcommittee in its hearings on the ABM will focus wider attention on how the Pentagon can secretly use public funds to mold public opinion. This is Big Brotherism in action. When Laird before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Feb. 20, sought to defend the General in charge of the SENTINEL campaign as "outstanding", Fulbright replied—

Nothing I have said should be interpreted to mean they are not outstanding. The danger is they are too outstanding. You give them the ability together with 80 billion dollars and there is no force in this country can stand up against them. That is what bothers me.

The Eisenhower Precedent

Laird told Senate Foreign Relations the Russians had held up their ABM system around Moscow in order to develop an improved model. The easiest way for Nixon to handle the ABM issue would be to do the same, and hold up deployment for more research and development. He could cite the best of precedents for this—Eisenhower's rejection in 1959 of the Nike-Zeus system when it was recommended by the Army. Dr. John S. Foster, whom Laird has retained as Director of Research at the Pentagon, told a Gore disarmament subcommittee hearing just two years ago that Nike-Zeus would have cost $13 to $14 billion and "most of it would have had to be torn out and replaced almost before it became operational" by the new Nike-X system, now called Sentinel. "By the same token," Dr. Foster warned, "other technological developments" would soon make Nike-X obsolete in turn.

The cynical answer to this was provided by Congressman Roman Pucinski of Chicago, one of the Sentinel's supporters. "I realize," he told a private briefing held by Gen. Starbird—Sentinel's "manager"—to try and quiet opposition among big city Congressmen*, "that as we move along in military technology, almost in every instance whatever we do becomes almost obsolete before it comes off the drawing board. That is the story of the defense establishment. That is the story of progress. We have spent a trillion dollars on defense hardware in the last 20 years. Much of that has become obsolete before it came into the field. But we cannot afford not to have this system." If we waste another trillion dollars on military hardware in the next 20 years, our whole social system may become obsolete.

Either a secretive, headstrong and (as events in so many spheres have shown) incompetent military bureaucracy will be cut down to size now or the sky will be the limit on arms expenditures. "The hard fact is," former Defense Secretary Clifford told the American Paper Institute in New York Feb. 17, "we may never again expect to be in as favorable a position as we now enjoy for entry into talks about a freeze in strategic nuclear armaments." He said technological developments would soon make agreement far more difficult. The combination of the ABM and MIRV, the multiple warhead, will breed suspicion and panic, setting off a completely new spiral. Our last hope of freeing resources for the racial and urban crises lies in a quick freeze now of missile and anti-missile and a cease-fire in Vietnam. There the guerrillas by attacking more than 200 military outposts and cities all over the country night after night for a week have demonstrated that they can strike at will anywhere they choose despite all the pap our military have been giving us about the enemy being on the ropes. They have also demonstrated that we could not escalate the war, as we have been doing since the peace talks in Paris started, without provoking a counter-offensive, and a sharp rise in our casualties. *March 2*

***Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile Briefing. House Appropriation Committee, Jan. 15 released Feb. 11.**

And (If An H-Bomb Falls) Don't Forget Your Zip Code

"If prevented from reporting for work because of an enemy attack, all selective service employees are to go to the nearest post office, get a Federal employee registration card, fill it out and give it to the postmaster. He will send it to the Civil Service which will inform National or State Headquarters and the employee will be told where to report for duty."

—Selective Service, *organ of the Selective Service System, February 1969*

Sorry Due to Recent Dock Strike Copies of "The Haunted Fifties" Have Not Yet Arrived—We Will Send Them Out As Soon As They Do

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, In A Time of Torment (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 3/10/69

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED